DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 831 CG 014 772

AUTHOR Ekstrom, Ruth B.
TITLE Professional Development, Promotion, and Pay Differences Between Women and Men in Educational Psychology.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 80
NOTE 39p.: Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (88th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, September 1-5, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Doctoral Degrees: Educational Psychology: *Equal Opportunities (Jobs): Graduate Study: *Professional Development: *Promotion (Occupational): *Psychologists: Questionnaires: *Salary Wage Differentials: *Sex Differences: Sex Discrimination: Underemployment

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire about graduate school and professional experiences was completed by 235 white females, 10 minority females, 198 white males, and 12 minority males who hold the doctoral degree and are members of the American Psychological Association, Division of Educational Psychology. Tentative findings, based on simple descriptive statistics, reveal that women have less access to research training and teaching assistantships than men. Women receive lower salaries than men and are less likely to be employed in doctoral degree-granting universities. Women have lower research productivity and are more likely to describe themselves as underemployed. A multivariate analysis of the interactions among the variables is necessary to determine whether or not discrimination caused these differences. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194831

Paper presented at the symposium, Women in Educational Psychology, APA Annual Meeting, Montreal Canada, September 1, 1980

Professional Development, Promotion, and Pay Differences Between Women and Men in Educational Psychology

Ruth B. Ekstrom

Educational Testing Service

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruth B. Ekstrom

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In June 1980, a questionnaire about graduate school and professional experiences was sent to all women who are members of the American Psychological Association Division 15 (Educational Psychology) and to a comparable size random sample of the male members of the division (approximately one-third of the male members). This paper is based on usable responses received from 235 white females, 10 minority females, 198 white males and 12 minority males who hold a doctoral degree.

Earlier studies of the status of women in psychology (APA Division 35 Task Force on Women Doing Research, 1978; Astin, 1972; Boneau and Cuca, 1974; Brodsky, 1974; Cates, 1973; Cox and Catt, 1977; Ekstrom, 1978; Fidell, 1970; Guyer and Fidell, 1973; and Sophie, 1974) have found that women graduate students more often than men: (1) choose a department or institution because of "spouse or loved one's association with the program or institution" or "proximity to home or job"; (2) receive the doctorate from a department with lower reputational rating and/or with lower faculty research productivity; (3) feel that there is sex discrimination in assignments; and (4) receive fewer research assistantships and less training in research. In their professional careers, women psychologists: (1) tend to be selected for lower levels of employment than

CG 014772

men with the same qualifications and training, (2) are more likely than men to work in clinics and private practice and less likely to work in research organizations, government agencies and business; (3) are more likely than men to have academic jobs in colleges and public school systems than in research universities; (4) are less likely than men to be involved in research or administrative activities; (5) more frequently hold part-time appointments or are unemployed; (6) are less productive researchers than men; and (7) receive lower salaries, and slower advancement than men. We were interested in exploring some of these problems within the field of educational psychology.

Description of the Respondents

Before going into the analysis of the graduate school and professional experience of the respondents, I would like to tell you a little about them.

Age. The age distribution of the male and female respondents is very similar; slightly more than 25% of each sex group are in each of three age cohorts, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, and 50 to 59. However, when age is related to doctoral cohort some significant differences emerge.

In examining age by doctoral cohort, we found that 67% of the white males who received the doctorate between 1970 and 1980 are currently age 39 or younger but that only 45% of the white females in the 1970-80 doctoral cohort are age 39 or younger. In the 1960-69 doctoral cohort, 55% of the white males are age 49 or younger compared to 46% of the white females. Sixty-six percent of the white males in the group who received The doctorate prior to 1960 are age 59 or younger but only 46% of the women

in this cohort age under age 60. Thus, we can see that the women, as a group, received their doctorates at a later age than did the men. This finding does not differ from previous research; National Research Council (1979) data shows that the median age for receipt of the doctorate in psychology in 1977 was 29.8 for males and 30.0 for females. Our data, however, shows a much larger sex difference suggesting, especially for the 1970-74 doctoral cohort, that a large portion of these women did not receive the doctorate until they were over 40.

Race. Minority group members comprise only about 5% of our total group of respondents. However, in the most recent, 1970-80, doctoral cohort, approximately 10% of the males and 6% of the females are minority group members. These figures are somewhat under the proportion of minority group members receiving doctorates in psychology in recent years. (National Research Council data for 1973-76 shows that approximately 12% of all psychology doctorates were awarded to minorities.)

Year of Doctorate. Nearly half (48%) of the respondents received the doctorates between 1970 and 1980. However, only 33% of the male respondents are members of this most recent doctoral cohort while 59% of the females belong to this group. Thirty-six percent of the respondents received the doctorate between 1960 and 1969; this cohort includes 41% of the males and 31% of the females. Individuals who received the doctorate prior to 1960 comprise 16% of all respondents; this group includes 26% of the males and 8% of the females. All minority respondents received the doctorate since 1965.

Because of the sex difference in the doctoral cohorts, most of the remaining data in this paper will be presented by doctoral cohort as well

as by sex. As Cole (1979) has pointed out, disaggregation of data is necessary in studies of discrimination to avoid incorrect conclusions.

Employment. Ninety-one percent of the respondents are employed full-time and 3% are employed part-time; one percent are unemployed and seeking work; five percent are either retired or unemployed and not seeking work. All minority respondents are employed full-time.

Part-time work is twice as common among women as men. For women, part-time work is found predominately in the more recent doctoral cohorts, suggesting a modification of work schedule for child-rearing. Part-time work for men appeared in the older doctoral cohorts suggesting a modification of work schedule leading to retirement.

There were no major sex differences in full time employment or unemployment, contrary to previous findings (National Research Council, 1979) that show women in psychology to be unemployed at rates three to five times as high as men.

Graduate Education

Since previous research has shown that women have encountered more problems than men while attending graduate school, we were interested to see if this would also be true in educational psychology. One problem affecting women is part-time attendance because of family responsibilities. Part-time doctoral students often are ineligible for financial aid and for jobs such as research assistant. In addition, part-time students miss much of the informal contact with faculty and peers that helps full-time graduate students become socialized into the profession.

Attendance. The date from our respondents shows striking sex differences in full-time graduate school attendance; 64% of the males but only 51%

of the females attended graduate school full time. However, these differences stem primarily from differences in the pre-1970 doctoral cohort. In the 1970-80 cohort, 64% of the males and 61% of the females attended full time. Only 38% of the women who received the doctorate prior to 1970 attended graduate school full time. Minority group members were more likely than whites to have attended graduate school full-time; 82% reported that they had been full-time graduate students. It seems safe to conclude that women who received the doctorate in educational psychology prior to 1970 are much more likely than men to have been part-time students and that, as a consequence of this experience, they will be at a disadvantage later in their professional careers. At the same time, it is gratifying to note that the sex differences in part-time graduate school attendance have diminished greatly in the past decade and also to note that minority graduate students are avoiding part-time attendance.

Financial Support. As was mentioned earlier, part-time students often have limited access to financial aid. In addition, there is reason to believe that women in psychology graduate programs have not received as much financial support, from sources such as research assistantships, as have men.

The data from our respondents does indeed show some sex and race differences in graduate school financial support. The most common source of support for both males and females was the individual him/herself; 59% of the males and 63% of the females contributed to the costs of their own graduate education. The most common source of support for minority group members was the research assistantship; 55% of the minority respondents had received this form of financial aid. Research assistantships were

less common for women than for men; 41% of the women but 47% of the men had held such assistantships. The men were also more likely to have received teaching assistantships; 50% of the male respondents but only 42% of the female respondents received this kind of aid. Women were more likely to have received fellowships than were men; 42% of the women but only 32% of the men and 32% of minorities had received fellowships. Twenty seven percent of the minority group members, 14% of the women, and 10% of the men received funds from the educational institution. Sex differences in the proportion of males and females receiving teaching assistantships appear to have been increasing from earlier doctoral cohorts to the most recent ones while sex differences in research assistantships appear to be diminishing in the more recent cohorts.

These findings are similar to financial support data reported by the National Research Council for psychologists who received the doctorate in 1973-76. In that group, women were more likely to have received fellowships than were men (27% vs. 22%), but were less likely to have received research assistantships (23% vs. 35%) or teaching assistantships (48% vs. 51%).

Collaboration on Faculty Research. Working with faculty on research projects is a good way for graduate students to acquire skills. In addition this experience may provide an opportunity to co-author a paper. In the past, it has been shown that women have had less access to this type of experiential learning than have white males.

The data from our respondents show that white male graduate students in educational psychology have indeed been involved in more collaborative research with faculty members than have women and minorities; 58% of males have collaborated on faculty research projects as compared to 50% of

females and 45% of minority group members. This suggests that there have been fewer opportunities for females and minorities to develop faculty mentor/sponsor relationships than for white males. Lack of this relationship can affect job opportunities after graduate school.

In addition, by not having taken part in research collaboration, the female and minority graduate students may have lost the chance to have a research publication other than the dissertation to show to prospective employers. This lack of collaborative research experience is probably a key point where women and minorities begin the process of accumulative disadvantage that will increasingly affect their careers.

Activities as a Graduate Student. There are other activities, in addition to collaborating on research, that can be viewed as part of the professional socialization of a graduate student. These include presenting papers at a professional meeting, publishing a paper, reviewing papers by others for journals or professional meetings, teaching classes, and taking part in the activities of a professional association like APA. Through these experiences the graduate student has the chance to acquire professional skills, to see how other members of the profession achieve recognition and status, and to begin accumulating personal recognition and status.

Minority group members were less likely to have attended professional association meetings or to have belonged to a professional association while in graduate school than majority individuals. It seems especially important that minority graduate students, who may experience considerable isolation in their academic institution, be encouraged to join professional associations, like APA, and be given financial resources to

permit them to attend meetings and to develop professional contacts with other students and professionals who share their interests.

Both women and minorities were less apt to have presented a paper at a professional meeting, published a paper, or taught classes while in graduate school than were white males. This lack of experience can and probably does act as an obstacle in the later careers of women and minorities. For example, individuals who did not teach classes in graduate school will probably have to spend more time developing their courses and teaching skills during their first few years in an academic job than individuals who have experience in college teaching. Individuals who do not have publications or presentations on their vita undoubtedly have more difficulty in obtaining a job or in obtaining as good a job as individuals who have made presentations and/or published. In addition, it may be more difficult for the young faculty member or researcher, without the help of a major professor, to find out the "system" for getting research published or presented at professional meetings.

Postdoctoral Training. Postdoctoral appointments are, in many fields an important way for the graduate student to acquire additional skills and to make the transition from student to professional. There has been previous evidence (Gilford and Snyder, 1977) that women doctorates in psychology planned postdoctoral training more frequently than did men.

Our respondents did not replicate this finding. Eight percent of the women, 9% of the men and 5% of the minority group members had held postdoctoral appointments. There was a marked decline in the frequency of postdoctoral training, for both men and women, from the 1960 doctoral cohort to the 1970-80 doctoral cohort.

Professional Experience

We have hypothesized that women and minority educational psychologists, who tend to have different graduate school experiences than white males, may be at a disadvantage in seeking jobs. We can also hypothesize that the effect of this disadvantage will tend to accumulate throughout their professional careers.

Work Setting. Since women reported fewer graduate school research assistantships than men and since both women and minorities reported less colloboration on faculty research, we can anticipate that women and minorities will be less frequently employed in the research-oriented doctorate granting universities than white males. This was confirmed by our respondents; 46% of the males, 36% of minority group members, and 34% of the females are employed in doctorate granting universities. The sex difference in the percentage of males and females employed in these universities is greatest in the earlier doctoral cohorts. This may support our hypothesis of accumulative disadvantage or it may show that universities have made a greater effort in hiring women during the past decade than they did earlier.

Women tend to be employed more frequently than men in post-secondary institutions that do not award a doctorate (28% vs. 21%). These differences in work settings may mean that women have less time to do research and/or that they receive less recognition for doing research. They also suggest that there will be sex differences in the work duties reported.

Work Duties. The most frequently reported work duty for males was research (63%); teaching was a very close second (62%). The most frequent reported duty for females was teaching (66%) followed by research (60%). For minorities, administration was the most frequently reported duty (64%);

research and teaching ranked second and third (59% and 50%).

While these differences are not large, they tend to confirm our hypothesis that the lack of graduate school research training and experience affects subsequent professional careers.

Academic Rank. Since over 70% of our respondents are employed in post-secondary education, we were interested in finding out about academic rank. In the past, women have advanced to the tenure level jobs of professor and associate professor less rapidly and less frequently than men.

The aggregated data from our respondents suggested that this finding would be confirmed; 85% of the males, 78% of the females, and 50% of minority individuals reported that they held rank of professor or associate professor. However, a closer examination of the data disaggregated by doctoral cohorts showed this to be an artifact of the sex ratios in the cohorts. In the 1970-80 cohort, which includes almost all of the assistant professors and instructors, 63% of the women hold the rank of professor or associate professor but only 50% of the males have achieved these ranks. Thus, it appears as if the women who have obtained the doctorate in educational psychology since 1970 are achieving the upper ranks in academia more rapidly than are the men. This difference may be partially explained by the difference in work settings. Another possible explanation is that the women, despite their more limited research and teaching experience in graduate school, outperform the men on the criteria necessary for promotion to the upper ranks.

Research Productivity. In many post-secondary institutions, but especially in doctorate granting universities, research productivity plays an important part in promotion decisions. The evidence about male-female differences in research productivity is somewhat conflicting. One study

of psychologists (Guyer and Fidell, 1973) found that men published significantly more than women while another (Sophie, 1974) found that, although men published more than women, most of the difference in publication rate could be explained by differences in the work setting and the positions held by males and females.

Our respondents told us the number of books and articles they have published. There may be some minor differences in how "publication" was defined by the respondents. Seven percent of the males, 11% of the females and 9% of minority group members reported that they had never published an article. Thirty-one percent of the males, 44% of the females, and 55% of minority group members had published between one and nine articles. The sex differences in publication rate were smaller in the more recent doctoral cohorts but still favor males. In the group that received the doctorate prior to 1960 the sex differences in publication rate are more pronounced; nearly half (49%) of the males in this group had published 40 or more articles, compared to only about a quarter (24%) of the females.

Book publication rate also appears to favor males but the sex differences are less pronounced. Fifty-seven percent of the males, 55% of the females, and 86% of minority group members have never published a book; 22% of the males and 31% of the females have published one or two books; 21% of the males and 14% of the females have published three or more books. In the most recent, 1970-80, doctoral cohort, however, more females than males have published one or more books; only 17% of the males in this group are book authors, compared to 31% of the females.

It will obviously be necessary to conduct a multivariate analysis to identify the relationships between academic rank, work setting, job duties

and research productivity. Such an analysis was beyone the time and resources available for this report: we hope to do the analysis this winter.

Salary. Another indicator of professional success is salary. Previous research (Boneau and Cuca, 1974) has shown that women in psychology receive lower salaries than men and that the salary gap between men and women widens with time and experience. Thus we would expect the largest salary differences in those who received the doctorate before 1960.

The information from our respondents confirms what the earlier research has found--salaries paid to full-time employed males in educational psychology are higher than salaries paid to full-time employed women and minorities. Forty-five percent of the males reported salaries of $35,000 a year or higher, compared to 25% of the females and 15% of the minority group members.

These salary differences persist in every doctoral cohort but are, as anticipated, greatest for those who received the doctorate before 1960. In the most recent, 1970-80, doctoral cohort, we found that 36% of the males and 52% of the females had salaries below $25,000. In the oldest, pre-1960, doctoral cohort, we found that 49% of the males, compared to 25% of the females, had salaries of $40,000 or higher. Forty-five percent of the women in this group, compared to 8% of the men, had salaries below $30,000.

While the salary data should also undergo a multivariate analysis to control for sex differences in work setting, we can conclude that the salary differences reported are substantial and that they strongly support the hypothesis of accumulated disadvantage for females in educational psychology.

Underemployment. Still another indication of professional status is whether or not an educational psychologist feels that s/he is under-

employed, either in a job that is outside the field, or in a job that does not utilize the individual's training and/or experience.

Seventeen percent of our male respondents, 24% of the female respondents, and 36% of the minority respondents said that they felt underemployed. For males, unemployment increased from 4% in the pre-1960 doctoral cohort to 23% in the most recent, 1970-80, doctoral cohort. For females, a U-shaped curve occurs, with the lowest underemployment (15%) in the 1960-69 doctoral cohort and higher underemployment in the older (23%) and younger (28%) cohorts.

I hypothesize that the reported underemployment in the 1970-80 cohort may be largely a function of the increased doctoral production combined with the tightening academic market for Ph.D's. However, males in this cohort report less underemployment than females (23% vs. 28%). This could be due to discrimination in hiring or it could arise from decisions made by females to take more marginal jobs in order to be near their spouse. Reported underemployment in the 1960-69 doctoral cohort is essentially comparable for males and females. It seems likely that the individuals in this cohort had better job opportunities than have the younger cohort. In addition, the women in this cohort may have had sufficient job experience to benefit most from institutional efforts in the 1970's to improve the status of women. If such efforts were made, however, they do not appear to have extended to women who received the doctorate before 1960 and who, quite likely, met with substantial discrimination in the early years of their employment. Twenty-three percent of the women in this cohort, compared to 4% of the men, report they are underemployed.

We can hypothesize a model from this data that underemployment occurs

when job opportunity decreases and/or when discrimination occurs. Diminishing job opportunities appear to affect all groups while discrimination affects women and minorities.

Status. One of the best indices of having achieved high status in the profession is being elected a Fellow of APA. This acknowledges that the quality of one's work is recognized by one's peers. Previous research has shown that differential evaluation of professional accomplishment often occurs for males and females. In one study, the identical articles were rated of lower quality when they were believed to be the work of women than when they were believed to be the work of men. Thus, we can expect to find fewer women than men elected to Fellow status, even when the quality and quantity of their work is equal.

The data from our respondents confirms this expectation. Thirteen percent of the males, 5% of the females, and none of the minority group members reported that they were Fellows of APA Division 15. There is little difference in Fellow status for individuals who received the doctorate since 1960 but the difference is marked for individuals who received the doctorate prior to 1960. In that cohort, 38% of the males compared to 24% of the females, hold Fellow status.

These data also need a multivariate analysis, especially to partial out the effects of differences in publication rate. However, it does appear that minorities in all doctoral cohorts and women who received the doctorate prior to 1960 are underrepresented among the Fellows of Division 15.

There are other forms of professional recognition that are an acknowledgement of status in educational psychology. These include being asked to review proposals for Federal agencies or for foundations, being

asked to review articles submitted to professional journals, and holding office in a national or regional professional organization. We found that, in three of these four forms of recognition, males exceeded females and minority group members. More men had done proposal reviews (47% for men vs. 37% for women and 41% for minorities), journal article reviews (61% for men vs. 50% for women and 59% for minorities) and had served as journal editors or board members (39% for men vs. 23% for women and minorities). Women were more likely to have held office in a professional organization than were men or minorities (42% for women vs. 38% for men and 27% for minorities). However, many of these differences vanish when one examines the doctoral cohorts. For example, there were only minor sex differences in the 1970-80 doctoral cohort on proposal review, editing and editorial boards, and holding office; the females in this cohort exceeded the males in reviewing articles for journals (41% vs. 37%). Similarly, in the pre-1960 cohort, the females exceeded the males in all forms of recognition except serving as a journal editor.

Conclusions. This survey suggests that women who are members of Division 15 have had less access to research training and to teaching assistantships in graduate school than do men. It also shows that as professionals women are less likely to be employed in doctoral degree granting universities and to receive lower salaries than men. This difference in work setting may account for the lower research productivity, the higher reported rate of underemployment, and their underrepresentation as Fellows of the division. However, these conclusions should be considered only tentative, since they are based on simple descriptive

statistics. A more sophisticated multivariate analysis of the interaction of these variables must be done before we can determine whether or not discrimination caused these differences.

American Psychological Association, Division 35 Task Force on Women Doing Research. Barriers to Research in Psychology, 1978.

Astin, H. S. Employment and career status of women psychologists. American Psychologist, 1972, 27(5), 371-381

Boneau, C. A., & Cuca, J. M. An overview of psychology's human resources: characteristics and salaries from the 1972 APA survey. American Psychologist, 1974, 29(11), 821-840.

Brodsky, A. Women as graduate students. American Psychologist, 1974, 29(7), 523-526.

Cates, J. Sex and salary. American Psychologist, 1973, 28(10), 929.

Cole, J. R. Fair Science: Women in the Scientific Community. New York: Free Press, 1979.

Cox, W. M., & Catt, V. Productivity ratings of graduate programs in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. American Psychologist, 1977, 32(10), 793-813.

Ekstrom, R. B. Problems of women researchers at three stages of professional development. Paper presented at the Symposium on Problems in the Professional Development of Women Researchers, Annual Meeting, American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada, August 30, 1978.

Fidell, L. S. Empirical verification of sex discrimination in hiring practices in psychology. American Psychologist, 1970, 25(12), 1094-1098.

Gilford, D. M., & Snyder, J. Women and minority Ph.D.'s in the 1970's: a data book. Washington, D. C.: National Research Council, 1977.

Guyer, L., & Fidell, L. Publications of men and women psychologists. American Psychologist, 1973, 28(2), 157-160.

National Research Council. Climbing the Academic Ladder: Doctoral Women Scientists in Academe. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1979.

Sophie, J. Women as scholars. American Psychologist, 1974, 29(7), 529-532.

SURVEY OF APA DIVISION 15 MEMBERS

I. Description of Respondents

A. Current Age of Respondents by Doctoral Cohort

	MALES						FEMALES						TOTAL
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
20-29	5%	0	0	0	0	2%	2%	0	0	0	0	1%	1%
30-39	62%	100%	11%	33%	0	27%	43%	67%	7%	0	0	28%	28%
40-49	27%	0	44%	50%	2%	26%	27%	11%	39%	50%	8%	28%	27%
50-59	3%	0	31%	0	64%	29%	19%	11%	39%	50%	38%	27%	28%
60+	0	0	7%	17%	28%	10%	4%	0	9%	0	46%	18%	10%
No Response	3%	0	7%	0	6%	5%	4%	11%	5%	0	8%	9%	5%

B. Year of Doctorate for All Full Time Employed Respondents

	MALES						FEMALES						TOTAL	
	White		Minority		All Males		White		Minority		All Females			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1975-80	22	12	1	8	23	12	38	18	1	10	39	17	62	15
1970-74	36	20	5	42	41	21	87	41	7	70	94	42	135	33
1965-69	43	24	6	50	49	26	43	20	2	20	45	20	94	23
1960-64	28	16	0	0	28	15	25	12	0	0	25	11	53	13
1955-59	21	12	0	0	21	11	10	5	0	0	10	4	31	7
1945-54	25	14	0	0	25	13	10	5	0	0	10	4	35	8
Before 1945	4	2	0	0	4	2	1	*	0	0	1	*	5	1
	179		12		191		214		10		224		415	

* = Less than 1%

C. Current Employment Status of All Respondents with Doctorates

	MALES				FEMALES				TOTAL	
	White		Minority		White		Minority			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full Time	179	90	12	100	214	91	10	100	415	91
Part Time	4	2	0	0	9	4	0	0	13	3
Unemployed--seeking work	3	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	5	1
Unemployed--not seeking work, retired, etc.	12	6	0	0	10	4	0	0	22	5
	198		12		235		10		455	

II. Graduate School Experiences of Educational Psychologists
(Full Time Employed Doctoral Degree Holders Only)

A. Attendance

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
Full Time	61%	67%	59%	100%	71%	64%	58%	88%	38%	50%	38%	51%	82%
Part Time	7%	0	14%	0	10%	10%	10%	0	16%	50%	14%	12%	4%
Some of Both	32%	33%	27%	0	19%	26%	31%	12%	46%	0	48%	37%	14%

B. Sources of Support

Fellowship	32%	50%	39%	33%	18%	32%	41%	12%	40%	50%	38%	42%	32%
Teaching Assistant	58%	50%	49%	33%	44%	50%	45%	25%	38%	50%	43%	42%	36%
Research Assistant	46%	50%	45%	83%	46%	47%	44%	50%	37%	0	33%	41%	55%
Educational Institution	14%	17%	7%	50%	4%	10%	17%	25%	12%	0	5%	14%	27%
Self	63%	50%	68%	33%	46%	59%	59%	25%	71%	100%	71%	63%	41%
Spouse/Family	47%	33%	41%	17%	42%	43%	46%	25%	40%	50%	33%	43%	32%
Loan	23%	33%	21%	17%	6%	17%	15%	12%	10%	0	0	12%	14%
GI Bill/Other	28%	33%	27%	33%	58%	35%	4%	25%	15%	0	5%	9%	18%

C. Collaboration on Research with Faculty

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
No/No Response	35%	17%	42%	50%	52%	42%	44%	75%	53%	100%	52%	50%	55%
Yes/Women Only	2%	17%	1%	0	0	2%	2%	0	0	0	5%	1%	5%
Yes/Men Only	36%	50%	44%	33%	30%	38%	35%	0	32%	0	33%	32%	23%
Yes/Both	28%	17%	13%	17%	18%	18%	19%	25%	15%	0	10%	17%	18%
D. Activities as a Graduate Student													
Attend prof. meeting	92%	100%	90%	50%	84%	89%	91%	37%	82%	100%	100%	88%	64%
Belong prof. association	92%	100%	77%	67%	74%	83%	84%	50%	85%	100%	76%	83%	73%
Present paper	55%	67%	48%	17%	56%	53%	50%	13%	49%	0	57%	49%	27%
Publish paper	56%	67%	45%	17%	58%	53%	35%	25%	43%	0	48%	38%	32%
Teach classes	80%	83%	72%	50%	64%	73%	72%	50%	60%	50%	57%	67%	59%
Member prof. committee	22%	33%	14%	0	8%	15%	13%	13%	16%	0	33%	16%	14%
Review papers	18%	33%	10%	17%	10%	14%	15%	38%	9%	50%	14%	14%	32%
E. Postdoctoral Appointment													
Yes	7%	17%	8%	0	14%	9%	6%	0	9%	0	19%	8%	5%
No/No Response	93%	83%	92%	100%	86%	91%	94%	100%	91%	100%	81%	92%	95%

III. Professional Experiences of Educational Psychologists
(Full Time Employed Doctoral Degree Holders Only)

A. Work Setting

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
Doctorate Granting Univ.	31%	33%	55%	50%	54%	46%	27%	38%	46%	0	44%	34%	36%
Medical/Prof. School	3%	0	4%	17%	6%	5%	3%	0	1%	0	6%	3%	5%
College/Other Univ.	24%	50%	21%	0	14%	20%	31%	13%	21%	0	22%	26%	18%
Jr./Comm. College	2%	0	0	0	0	1%	2%	0	1%	0	0	2%	0
Elem/Sec School	3%	0	6%	0	2%	4%	9%	0	12%	0	6%	9%	0
Fed/State/ Local Govt.	12%	17%	3%	17%	6%	7%	7%	0	1%	50%	6%	5%	14%
R&D/Nonprofit	7%	0	3%	0	12%	6%	7%	13%	6%	50%	6%	7%	9%
Business and Industry	5%	0	6%	17%	4%	5%	4%	13%	6%	0	6%	5%	9%
Other	14%	0	3%	0	2%	6%	10%	25%	6%	0	6%	9%	9%

B. Duties

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
Research	53%	83%	65%	50%	72%	63%	61%	50%	63%	50%	48%	60%	59%
Development	14%	33%	14%	33%	18%	16%	23%	0	21%	0	14%	21%	18%
Administration	46%	50%	48%	50%	42%	46%	41%	75%	53%	100%	67%	49%	64%
Teaching	49%	67%	70%	67%	64%	62%	68%	38%	68%	0	71%	66%	50%
Evaluation	34%	17%	14%	33%	6%	19%	30%	0	24%	0	19%	25%	14%
Counseling	27%	0	13%	17%	16%	18%	30%	25%	19%	0	24%	25%	14%
Other	10%	0	10%	17%	8%	9%	19%	13%	26%	0	10%	20%	9%

C. Academic Rank (Based on 128 white males, 8 minority males, 139 white females, and 4 minority females in postsecondary academic positions.)

Instructor/ Asst. Prof.	47%	75%	2%	0	0	15%	35%	75%	4%	0	0	22%	50%
Prof./Assoc. Prof.	53%	25%	98%	100%	100%	85%	65%	25%	96%	100%	100%	78%	50%

D. Research Productivity

a. Articles

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
0	11%	0	9%	0	0	7%	17%	13%	3%	0	0	11%	9%
1-9	53%	50%	20%	33%	16%	31%	54%	75%	33%	50%	20%	44%	55%
10-19	18%	0	19%	17%	10%	16%	18%	13%	22%	50%	20%	20%	14%
20-29	12%	33%	20%	33%	14%	16%	6%	0	19%	0	24%	12%	18%
30-39	2%	17%	19%	0	12%	11%	3%	0	7%	0	12%	5%	5%
40+	5%	0	14%	0	49%	21%	2%	0	15%	0	24%	8%	0

b. Books

0	83%	67%	53%	83%	34%	57%	69%	100%	44%	100%	23%	55%	86%
1 or 2	10%	33%	31%	17%	24%	22%	26%	0	35%	0	41%	31%	14%
3+	7%	0	15%	0	42%	21%	5%	0	21%	0	37%	14%	0

E. Salary

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
Less than $15,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	3%	0	0	0	0	2%	0
$15,000-$19,999	12%	0	4%	0	2%	6%	17%	0	9%	0	5%	14%	0
$20,000-$24,999	24%	67%	7%	57%	4%	12%	32%	17%	18%	0	10%	26%	43%
$25,000-$29,999	36%	17%	11%	14%	2%	17%	27%	0	18%	50%	25%	24%	14%
$30,000-$34,999	12%	17%	30%	14%	18%	21%	11%	67%	13%	0	5%	11%	29%
$35,000-$39,999	7%	0	20%	14%	24%	17%	5%	0	19%	0	30%	12%	5%
$40,000+	9%	0	28%	0	49%	28%	6%	17%	22%	50%	25%	13%	10%

F. Underemployment

Yes	23%	50%	17%	33%	4%	17%	28%	25%	15%	50%	23%	24%	36%
No	77%	50%	83%	67%	96%	83%	72%	75%	85%	50%	77%	76%	64%

G. APA Membership Status

	MALES						FEMALES						ALL MINORITIES
	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	1970-80		1960-69		Before 1960	All	
	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	White	Minority	White	Minority	White	Females	
Fellow	2%	0	6%	0	38%	13%	0	0	9%	0	24%	5%	0
Member	92%	100%	94%	100%	62%	85%	87%	100%	88%	100%	76%	91%	100%
Associate	7%	0	0	0	0	2%	6%	0	0	0	0	4%	0

H. Additional Professional Recognition

Proposal Review	27%	33%	54%	50%	62%	47%	27%	38%	44%	50%	71%	37%	41%
Journal Article Review	34%	67%	68%	50%	84%	61%	41%	50%	54%	100%	86%	50%	59%
Journal Editor/ Board	18%	33%	39%	33%	66%	39%	16%	0	29%	50%	52%	23%	23%
Prof. Organization Office	27%	17%	37%	17%	56%	38%	29%	25%	53%	100%	81%	42%	27%